

Remarks:

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 15-25 have been canceled.

Regarding independent claim 1, Examiner rejects independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being patentable over Hall et al. (US Pat. No. 6,026,375) in view of Hendrey et al. (US Pat. Appl. Pub. 2002/0107008A1). Applicants respectfully disagree. Examiner states that while "Hall fails to disclose receiving a second signal indicative of a location of the second party, wherein the second signal is received at the central scheduling computer," "Hendrey teaches receiving a second signal indicative of a location of the second party, where in the second signal is received at the central scheduling computer (Para 69-71)." However, in paragraph 71 of Hendrey, it describes a distance between two parties, and not the location of the second party. "Step 705 determines the distance between the caller and the potential match selected in the current iteration of step 704." Hendrey, para. 71. Therefore, independent claim 1 is patentable over Hall in view of Hendrey.

Regarding dependent claims 2-6, dependent claims 2-6 depend from and include all the limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2-6 are patentable over Hall in view of Hendrey.

Regarding independent claim 7, Examiner rejects independent claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) as being disclosed by Hall. Examiner indicates that the step of "transmitting a second signal to a second party when the first location is equal to a first predetermined location" is disclosed by Hall in col. 3 lines 34-40. Applicants respectfully disagree. Hall describes in col. 3 lines 34-40 a mobile of a customer first "receiving location information from a location determination system," then the same mobile "transmitting the location information to the service provider," and finally the same mobile "receiving local facility information identifying a local facility that is able to satisfy the order." Hall does not disclose transmission of a signal based upon a first location being equal to a first predetermined location. Therefore, independent claim 1 is patentable over Hall.

Jul. 29. 2003 10:33AM MOTOROLA CSS IPD

App. No. 09/801,093

No. 0438 P. 6/8

Page 6 of 8

Regarding dependent claims 8-14, dependent claims 8-14 depend from and include all the limitations of independent claim 7. Therefore, dependent claims 8-14 are patentable over.

Claims 15-25 have been canceled.

In view of the discussion above, the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance. Kindly withdraw any rejections and objections and allow this application to issue as a United States Patent without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,
Chen, et al.

MOTOROLA, INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPT. (SF)
600 NORTH U.S. HIGHWAY 45, AN475
LIBERTYVILLE, ILLINOIS 60048

Shigeharu Furukawa
Shigeharu Furukawa July 29, 2003
REG. NO. 50,481
TELEPHONE NO. (847) 523-1987
FACSIMILE NO. (847) 523-2350

Official

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 30 2003

GROUP 3600